DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 595 SP 017 972

AUTHOR Smith, Douglas K.
TITLE Classroom Management Styles and Personality Variables of Teachers and Education Majors: Similarities and Differences.
SPONS AGENCY Wisconsin Univ., River Falls.
PUB DATE Apr 81
GRANT 0365-4-79
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; *Discipline Policy; Discipline Problems; Dogmatism; *Education Majors; Induction; Locus of Control; *Personality Traits; Sex Differences; Student Behavior; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; *Teachers; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

This study: (1) examined approaches of teacher education majors and experienced regular classroom teachers to classroom misbehavior; (2) compared the two groups on selected personality variables (locus of control, Machiavellianism, dogmatism, state-trait anxiety); and (3) examined the relationship of classroom management style to these personality variables. The classroom management styles of 158 experienced teachers and 155 education majors were examined using a questionnaire based on the induction-sensitization paradigm of socialization. The results of the personality measures indicated that the inductive approach to management was associated with an internal locus of control and openness to new ideas for the education majors. This study has demonstrated that experienced classroom teachers and teacher education majors approach student misbehavior in very similar ways. Gender differences, although present in both groups, were stronger for the education majors. Detailed analyses of these results and suggestions for future research are provided. (Author/CJ)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED200595

# Classroom Management Styles and Personality Variables of Teachers and Education Majors: Similarities and Differences[1, 2]

Douglas K. Smith

University of Wisconsin--River Falls

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Douglas K. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running head: Classroom Management Styles

[1]This research was supported by Research Grant 0865-4-79 from the Institutional Research Committee of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

[2]Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

SP017972

## Abstract

Classroom management styles of 158 experienced teachers and 155 education majors were examined using a questionnaire based on the induction-sensitization paradigm of socialization. No significant differences between the two groups were indicated; however, significant gender differences were noted with the females of both groups displaying a more inductive style of classroom management as compared to the males. The results of four personality measures indicated that the inductive approach to management was associated with an internal locus of control and openness to new ideas for the education majors. Detailed analyses of these results and suggestions for future research are provided.

# Classroom Management Styles and Personality Variables of Teachers and Education Majors: Similarities and Differences

Classroom management is a frequently discussed concept but one that researchers have ignored to a great extent (Brophy and Putnam, 1979). Although teacher effectiveness has been the focus of many research studies and several recent reviews (Brophy, 1979; Brophy and Putnam, 1979; Gage, 1978; Good, 1979) have attempted a synthesis of their results, a teacher's overall style of classroom management has not been addressed. The majority of these research studies have emphasized differences in specific, observable behaviors between more effective teachers and less effective teachers (in terms of student achievement gains) with little attention to the individual's overall approach to classroom behavior.

Smith (1978a) emphasized the role of the teacher as a socializing agent and proposed a model of teaching based on the induction-sensitization paradigm of parental socialization developed by Aronfreed (1968). A questionnaire which assesses the teacher's style of socialization was developed and validated through classroom observation. The research verified two distinct styles of classroom management. The inductive style was characterized by an emphasis on the child's role and responsibility in behavioral situations, the use of positive reinforcement, the ignoring of inappropriate behavior (whenever possible), and techniques to facilitate the development of internal controls over behavior. The sensitizing style was distinguished by little attention to the child's motives or responsibilities in the behavioral situation, an emphasis on the punishment of misbehavior, the ignoring of appropriate behavior and a reliance on external control of behavior (Smith,

1977, 1978a). These styles of socialization are outlined in greater detail in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Research with this model (Smith, 1978a) has demonstrated that classroom teachers were more sensitizing in their response to male students and in resolving aggressive and dependent behaviors. Recent research (Smith, 1980) confirmed these results and indicated that male teachers were more sensitizing in response to students (especially males) than female teachers.

The source of an individual's socialization style has not been conclusively established. One study (Smith, 1978a) indicated that special education teachers were significantly more inductive than regular classroom teachers. Learning disabilities teachers were found to be significantly more inductive than experienced, regular classroom teachers (Smith and Beattie, 1980). In addition, Smith (1980) demonstrated that advanced graduate students in school psychology were significantly more inductive than regular classroom teachers. Differences in training may be responsible for the difference in socialization style. If training is a key component in approach to classroom management, undergraduate education majors (who are just beginning their training) and experienced, regular classroom teachers may differ in their approach to classroom management.

An additional variable that may relate to classroom management style is one's personality. Frequently researched personality variables and ones that may relate to socialization style include locus of control, dogmatism, Machiavellianism and anxiety. Locus of control refers to the degree to which

individuals attribute reinforcement to their own behavior or to circumstances beyond their control (Rotter, 1966); dogmatism represents the openness of individuals to new beliefs or information (Rokeach, 1960); Machiavellianism refers to the tendency of individuals to manipulate others in interpersonal situations (Christie and Geis, 1968); while anxiety has been described as both a state, a transitory condition; and a trait, a more pervasive or generalized condition (Spielberger, Gorsuch and Lushene, 1970).

The relationship of personality variables to isolated teaching behaviors and to certain characteristics of undergraduate education majors has been examined in a number of studies. Porter and Cohen (1977) found that teachers with an internal locus of control produced higher achieving students. Stephens (1972) suggested that many teaching techniques were oriented toward the development of internal control. Mittag (1978) attempted to relate dogmatism and attitudes toward discipline to choice of grade level among female teacher education majors; Ahmuda (1977) derived norms for the Machiavellianism Scale V from a group of education majors; and Biggers (1977) discovered that low scorers on a Machiavellianism scale received higher ratings by their supervising teachers on nine of 25 scales. However, studies relating these personality variables to overall style of classroom management could not be located.

Therefore, the purposes of the present study were (1) to examine approaches of teacher education majors and experienced, regular classroom teachers to classroom misbehavior; (2) to compare the two groups on selected personality variables (locus of control, Machiavellianism, dogmatism, state-trait anxiety); and (3) to examine the relationship of classroom management style to these personality variables using the model of teaching proposed by Smith (1977, 1978a).

## Method

Subjects. The subjects for this study consisted of 155 teacher education majors at a university in the Midwest and 158 elementary level, regular classroom teachers from the same geographical area. The teacher education majors consisted of students beginning their professional training in teaching. On the basis of studies previously cited students planning to pursue special education training were not included in the sample. The teachers represented urban, rural and suburban schools in and around the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

Mean ages were 21.5 years for the education majors and 36.5 years for the teachers. The classroom teachers' level of teaching experience ranged from one year to 52 years with a mean of 10.4 years. The teacher education majors consisted of 50 males and 105 females, whereas the teachers consisted of 30 males and 128 females. All subjects were asked to participate voluntarily in the study. The nonparticipation rate was minimal.

Procedure. Data for the study were collected during the winter and spring of 1980. Each research participant completed the Classroom Management Questionnaire (Smith, Note 1) followed by one of four randomly assigned personality inventories: Machiavellianism Scale V (Christie and Geis, 1970); Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960); Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966); and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorsuch and Lushene, 1970). All instruments were administered according to their published instructions.

The Classroom Management Questionnaire (CMQ) assesses an individual's style of socialization through the use of 36 forced choice items involving 18 male and 18 female students engaged in dependent, aggressive and academic behaviors. The CMQ consists of male and female subscales with 18 items each

as well as aggressive, dependent and academic subscales with 12 items each (six with male students and six with female students). Each item is composed of a behavioral situation and two alternatives for resolving the situation. One alternative represents a sensitizing approach and the other represents an inductive approach. Inductive responses are scored positively.

Test-retest reliability for the CMQ was reported at 0.85 and the Kuder-Richardson procedure yielded an internal consistency estimate of 0.76 (Smith, 1977). Validation of the CMQ through direct classroom observation of groups of teachers scoring one standard deviation above and below the mean on the CMQ was accomplished by using the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories System. Statistically significant differences in teacher behavior, consistent with the induction-sensitization model, were revealed and are discussed in detail by Smith (1978b).

The Christie-Geis Machiavellianism Scale V measures the tendency to manipulate others through the use of 20 items with which the individual agrees or disagrees.

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale measures the extent to which a person's mind is open or closed to new alternatives or ideas through the use of items with which the individual agrees or disagrees.

The Internal-External Locus of Control Scale measures generalized expectancy for internal or external control through use of forced choice items.

The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory measures state anxiety and trait anxiety through the use of separate self-report scales.

## Results

One-way ANOVAs were performed on the inventory results with participant group (education major or teacher) as the independent variable and scores on

the inventories as the dependent variables. Within group ANOVAs were completed for each group with gender as the independent variable. Pearson product-moment correlations between the CMQ total score and the personality measures were computed for each group. Significance levels were set at .05 for all analyses with the exception of the subscales of the CMQ in which .01 significance levels were used. This was done in order to minimize the possibilities of Type I errors as a result of the large number of significance tests.

Results indicated no significant differences between the experienced classroom teachers and the teacher education majors in overall styles of classroom management, response to dependent and academic behaviors or in response to the behaviors of male and female students. A trend, $F$ (1,311) = 4.23, $p < .04$, was noted in approach to aggressive behavior with the teachers displaying a more inductive style. These results are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Significant gender differences on the CMQ and its subscales were indicated for both groups. For the teachers significant differences were noted in approach to male students with $F$ (1,156) = 7.90 and $p < .006$ and strong trends were present in response to dependent behavior with $F$ (1,156) = 2.85 and $p < .09$ and on the Full Scale with $F$ (1,156) = 3.26 and $p < .07$. In all cases female teachers selected inductive techniques more frequently than males. Detailed results are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

The teacher education majors displayed considerably stronger gender

differences. Significant differences were noted on the Full Scale with $F$ (1,153) = 17.63 and $p < .001$; in response to male students with $F$ (1,153) = 27.00 and $p < .001$ and female students with $F$ (1,153) = 5.74 and $p < .01$; and in resolving dependent behavior with $F$ (1,153) = 11.47 and $p < .001$ and aggressive behavior with $F$ (1,153) = 22.03 and $p < .001$. A strong trend was noted on the academic subscale with $F$ (1,153) = 4.39 and $p < .04$. In all cases female education majors selected inductive techniques more frequently than males. Detailed results are presented in Table 4.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

On the personality measures a significant difference was indicated between the experienced teachers and the education majors on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, $F$ (1,72) = 8.72, $p < .005$, and trends were indicated on trait anxiety, $F$ (1,30) = 3.02, $p < .09$; and locus of control with $F$ (1,78) = 2.66 and $p < .10$. The experienced teachers were less dogmatic, less anxious and exhibited a more internal locus of control. These results are presented in Table 5.

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

There were no significant gender differences for either group on the personality measures. Those results are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

---

Insert Tables 6 and 7 about here

---

Pearson product-moment correlations between overall style of classroom management and the personality variables of dogmatism, locus of control, Machiavellianism, state anxiety and trait anxiety were computed for each group.

Style of classroom management as measured by the CMQ was negatively correlated with locus of control ($r = -0.25$, $p < .08$) and dogmatism ($r = -0.45$, $p < .005$) for the teacher education majors. Thus, the inductive style of management was associated with an internal locus of control and openness/flexibility of beliefs for the teacher education majors. There were no significant correlations between style of classroom management and the personality variables for the experienced teachers. These correlational results are presented in Table 8.

Insert Table 8 about here

Discussion of Results

Classroom management style. This research has demonstrated that the approach to classroom management of experienced teachers and teacher education majors is remarkably similar. The scores obtained by both groups were consistent with the scores obtained by experienced teachers in other studies using the CMQ (Smith, 1978a, 1980).

Although gender differences were present for both groups, they were considerably stronger for the education majors. In all instances, however, males displayed a more sensitizing approach to classroom management. Previous research (Smith, 1978b) indicated that teachers using this approach to management employed more punishment and verbal reprimands than teachers using the inductive approach. Additional research (Aronfreed, 1968; Hoffman, 1977) has suggested that such approaches are largely ineffective in the prevention of future misbehavior. Consequently, male teachers and education majors may need additional guidance in the development of effective management strategies.

Since the gender differences were not as strong for experienced teachers, there is a possibility that classroom experience may serve to reduce the use of sensitizing techniques by males. Inspection of the data in Tables 3 and 4 indicates that the scores of female teachers and education majors were quite consistent, while the scores of male teachers were somewhat more inductive than their undergraduate counterparts. Longitudinal research, however, is needed to validate this hypothesis.

The teacher education majors in this study were just beginning their formal training in teaching and had not yet been exposed to instruction in classroom management; and yet their approach to classroom misbehavior did not differ significantly from experienced teachers. It is possible that one's style of classroom management is not significantly affected by teacher education training. Of course, longitudinal research is needed to verify this explanation. In such research the style of classroom management should be assessed upon entry into training programs, at completion of training and after receiving experience in the field. Such research is currently being developed.

The current research does raise the possibility that an individual's approach to classroom misbehavior may be determined by factors other than training in classroom management techniques. For example, an individual's style of socialization may be greatly influenced by the childrearing approach of the individual's parents. Numerous researchers (e.g. Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1967; Aronfreed, 1968; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974; Cherry and Lewis, 1976) have documented gender differences in regard to disciplinary practices of parents. Boys are usually described as receiving more physical punishment, less verbal interaction and less affection than girls. Ausubel, Sullivan and Ives (1980) concluded that several studies indicate that fathers direct more

vigorous discipline toward sons than toward daughters and are less affectionate to sons. These studies suggest that males are exposed to more sensitizing styles of socialization than females who experience more inductive approaches. Therefore, male teachers may adopt a more sensitizing style of classroom management on the basis of their own experiences.

Frequently, research studies involving teachers and/or education majors consist of female participants only. The gender differences established in the present study suggest that caution be used in interpreting studies of teacher behavior or classroom management that do not involve both male and female participants.

Personality variables. In the present study the teacher education majors displayed a significantly greater degree of dogmatism than the experienced teachers. Previous research (Victor and Otis, 1978) has suggested that dogmatism in preservice teachers is related to teacher-student social distance and emphasis on subject matter as demonstrated by such teacher behaviors as less expression of warmth, less use of positive reinforcement and displaying little enthusiasm. Another study (Rappaport, 1979) using college undergraduates indicated that the dogmatic individual is more threatened than the low dogmatic individual when faced with the need to integrate new beliefs into their belief system. Finally, McCann and Hamilton (1978) concluded that the higher the degree of dogmatism the higher was the satisfaction with directive as opposed to nondirective instruction in a sample of college undergraduates. These behavioral correlates of highly dogmatic individuals are consistent with key dimensions of the sensitizing style of socialization. Clearly such behaviors could distance the socializing agent (teacher) from the learner. Consequently these individuals would appear to benefit from structured approaches/programs

that provide knowledge and practice in developing more effective interpersonal skills. These behavioral descriptions also suggest that the dogmatic behavior could be a result of anxiety, especially in interpersonal situations. In the present study there was a trend for the teacher education majors to be more anxious than the experienced classroom teachers as measured by the trait anxiety scale.

There was a trend for the experienced classroom teachers to be more internally oriented on the locus of control measure. The scores for both the teachers and the teacher education majors were somewhat higher (more external) but well within the range of reported means for other American populations. For example, Rotter (1966) reported student mean scores of 8.2 for males and 8.3 for females; Rothberg (1980) reported mean scores of 8.29 for corporate executives; and Maroldo and Flachmeier (1978) reported student mean scores of 11.4. Studies (e.g. Hart and Libb, 1977; Pittman and Pittman, 1979) that have divided populations into internal and external groups have used scores of 12 to 15 and above as the external cutoff and scores of eight and less as the internal cutoff. Thus, both groups in the current research fall clearly within the average range. Consequently, the practical significance of the difference in scores may be minimal.

No significant differences were evident between the teacher education majors and experienced classroom teachers on Machiavellianism and state anxiety. The scores obtained by the participants in this study were consistent with those reported by other authors on Machiavellianism (Biggers, 1977 and Ahmuda, 1977) and state anxiety (Rappaport, 1979; Spielberger, Gorsuch and Lushene, 1970), and fell in the middle range for these personality measures.

The lack of gender differences on the personality measures for both

teachers and education majors was consistent with previous studies of undergraduate teacher education majors (e.g. Biggers, 1977). However, the majority of studies examining gender differences on these personality variables have used undergraduate populations rather than teacher education majors; and studies with teacher education majors have frequently used female participants only (e.g. Elmore and Ellett, 1978; Mittag, 1978). Consequently there is a continuing need to explore this issue with male and female teachers and education majors.

Classroom management style and personality variables. The correlational data obtained in the present study were somewhat confusing. For the teacher education majors classroom management style was negatively correlated with locus of control ($p < .08$) and dogmatism ($p < .005$). An internal locus of control and flexibility/openness in belief systems were associated with an inductive approach to classroom management. An external locus of control and dogmatic attitudes were associated with a sensitizing approach to classroom management. These results are consistent with a preliminary study of these variables (Smith, 1977) and are conceptually congruent.

Although the directions of correlations for classroom management style and personality measures are the same for experienced teachers and education majors, no significant correlations were obtained for the teacher group. Analysis of the distribution of scores on the CMQ for the teachers and education majors completing the dogmatism scale and the locus of control scale reveals marked differences in the two groups. Although the range of scores and mean scores on the CMQ are similar, the teachers' scores are markedly skewed toward the higher end of the distribution. (The skewness is -0.342 for the teachers and +0.68 for the education majors completing the dogmatism scale and -0.102

for the teachers and -0.579 for the education majors completing the locus of control scale). This finding along with the relatively small number of subjects may account for the failure to establish significant correlations between classroom management style and the personality measures for the teacher group.

It is also possible that the teacher group is not representative of teachers in general on these personality variables. A review of the literature did not reveal any studies examining these variables within an experienced, elementary teacher population. The personality characteristics of the teacher education majors were consistent with previously reported studies for such populations.

An alternative explanation for these results is that one's classroom management or socialization style is not related to personality variables but develops as a result of one's own socialization experiences and/or experience in using management techniques that the individual finds effective. Initially an individual may select classroom management strategies that are consistent with one's personality characteristics. As the individual gains experience in the classroom, the selection of classroom management techniques may be influenced to a greater degree by environmental factors. The influence of fellow teachers, one's own experiences and the popular literature for teachers, may assume greater roles. At the present time this explanation is tentative. It does suggest, however, that teachers may not have a consistent, organized approach to classroom management when they enter the field.

The correlational results for the teacher education majors indicate that the sensitizing approach to classroom management is associated with more externally oriented and more dogmatic individuals than the inductive approach. In other words, the undergraduate education major who is somewhat rigid and less open to new ideas and who attributes success and failure to

factors that cannot be controlled by the individual is more likely to use the sensitizing approach to classroom management.

Teacher training

This study suggests that male teachers and undergraduates prefer techniques that are more sensitizing/punitive than female teachers. The child development and teacher effectiveness literature indicates that such approaches are generally ineffective in preventing future misbehavior. Therefore, teacher training programs should, perhaps, focus additional attention on this population (male teacher education majors), and provide increased opportunities for preservice teachers to develop alternative approaches to classroom management.

At the same time the results of this study and others (Smith, 1978a, 1980) indicate that sensitizing techniques are most likely to be directed toward boys in the classroom by male teachers. Training programs at both the preservice and inservice level could be developed to emphasize this target group through the use of actual classroom incidents and practice in developing realistic, alternative techniques for resolution of misbehavior.

As previously discussed this study suggests that preservice programs should consider additional training in interpersonal skills. Such programs may be useful in overcoming the "distancing behavior" associated with the highly dogmatic individual. In addition, completion of such programs may bolster the confidence of preservice teachers in interpersonal interactions and reduce anxiety level. Since anxiety may lead to the adoption of sensitizing styles of classroom management for they focus on the teacher's control of the classroom by emphasizing the role of the teacher and his or her power in the classroom, a reduction in anxiety may allow the teacher to consider less rigid approaches to the classroom and interact with students on a more individual basis.

Future research

This study has raised a number of questions that need to be examined in future studies, including the stability or change in personality variables and classroom management styles of teacher education majors. A longitudinal study involving a measure of classroom management style and personality measures for preservice teachers is currently being developed by the author. Participants will be evaluated at the start of their professional training, at the time of graduation and finally, after receiving actual teaching experience. In this way it will be possible to determine the effect of teacher education training on classroom management style and personality characteristics.

At the same time the lack of significant correlations between classroom management style and dogmatism and locus of control in experienced teachers should be further investigated with a larger sample of teachers. Longitudinal studies examining the effects of teaching experience on classroom management style and personality would also be beneficial.

In discussing the results of this study it was hypothesized that an individual's own socialization experiences may be an important determinant in style of classroom management. This should be investigated more thoroughly by examining the relationship of parental socialization style to the subsequent classroom management style of the individual.

Previous research (Smith and Beattie, 1980) has indicated that the classroom management styles of special education teachers differ significantly from the styles of regular education teachers. There is a continuing need to investigate this difference. The role of personality variables in selecting an area of specialty for teachers and education majors should be more thoroughly examined.

In summary, the present study has demonstrated that experienced classroom teachers and teacher education majors approach student misbehavior in very similar ways. Gender differences, although present in each group, were stronger for the education majors. The roles of personality variables and teacher training in the development of a teacher's socialization style remain unclear and offer a fertile ground for future research.

## Reference Notes

1. Smith, D. K. Classroom Management Questionnaire. 1977. (Available from Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, River Falls, WI 54022)

## References

Ahumada, E. A. Manipulative skills and educational personnel (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 3158A. (University Microfilms No. 77-27, 159)

Aronfreed, J. Conduct and conscience: The socialization of internalized control over behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Ausubel, D. P., Sullivan, E. V., & Ives, S. W. Theory and problems of child development. (3rd ed.). New York: Grune and Stratton, 1980.

Biggers, J. L. Machiavellianism in a prospective teacher group. Education, 1977, 98 (1), 91-96.

Brophy, J. E. Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71 (6), 733-750.

Brophy, J. E., and Putnam, J. G. Classroom management in the elementary grades. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), Classroom management: The seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.

Cherry, L., and Lewis, M. Mothers and two year olds: A study of sex-differentiated aspects of verbal interaction. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12 (4), 278-282.

Christie, R., and Geis, F. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Elmore, R., and Ellett, L. A canonical analysis of personality characteristics, personal and teaching practice, beliefs and dogmatism of beginning teacher education students. Journal of Experimental Education, 1978, 47 (2), 112-117.

Gage, N. L. The scientific basis of the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Good, T. L. Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30 (2), 52-64.

Hart, J., and Libb, J. Interaction of locus of control, skill vs. chance instructions, and task difficulty. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 1059-1069.

Hoffman, M. Personality and social development. In M. Rosenzweig and L. Porter (Eds.). Annual review of psychology (Vol. 28). Palo Alto: CA: Annual Reviews, 1977--

Hoffman, M., and Saltzstein, H. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5 (1), 45-57.

Maccoby, E., and Jacklin, C. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1974.

McCann, S., and Hamilton, M. Interaction of student satisfaction, dogmatism and the structure dimension of teacher directiveness. Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15 (2), 302-309.

Mittag, M. C. Dogmatism and attitudes regarding discipline as predictors of selection of elementary level among teacher education majors (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 1196A. (University Microfilms No. 78-16, 594)

Maroldo, G. K., and Flachmeier, L. C. Machiavellianism, locus of control and cognitive styles of American and West German coeds. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 1315-1317.

Pittman, N., and Pittman, T. Effects of helplessness training and internal-external locus of control on mood and performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37 (1), 39-47.

Porter, J., and Cohen, M. Personal causation and locus of control: An analysis of selected teacher characteristics and their relations to student achievement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.

Rappaport, E. Effects of dogmatism on state anxiety during the analysis and synthesis of new beliefs. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1979, 43, 284-288.

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rothberg, D. Professional achievement and locus of control: A tenuous inference reconsidered. Psychological Reports, 1980, 46, 183-188.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

Smith, D. K. Development and validation of the Classroom Management Questionnaire (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1977) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 4590A-4591A.

Smith, D. K. Teacher styles of classroom management. Journal of Educational Research, 1978a, 71 (5), 277-283.

Smith, D. K. A study of contrasting styles of teacher behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, March 1978b. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 785)

Smith, D. K. Classroom management: A key variable in consultation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, Washington, D. C., March 1980.

Smith, D., and Beattie, M. Classroom management styles and their implications for mainstreaming. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1980.

Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., and Lushene, R. E. STAI manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1970.

Stephens, M. W. Dimensions of locus of control: Impact of early educational experiences. Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1972, 7 (1), 137-138. (Summary)

Victor, J., and Otis, J. Teacher strength and sensitivity behavior: Attitude and personality correlates. Journal of Experimental Education, 1978, 47 (1), 9-15.

TABLE 1

INDUCTION/SENSITIZATION: CONCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES

| INDUCTION | SENSITIZATION |
|---|---|
| Definition: style of socialization that emphasizes the student's role in a behavioral situation and facilitates the development of internalized controls over behavior | Definition: style of socialization that emphasizes the specific behavioral situation and utilizes techniques that "sensitize" the student to the painful external consequences of misbehavior |
| source of internal orientation to student's control over behavior | source of external orientation to student's control over behavior |
| emphasis on internalized standards of appropriate behavior | emphasis on external standards of appropriate behavior |
| desirable behavior reinforced<br>inappropriate behavior ignored (if possible) | desirable behavior ignored<br>inappropriate behavior punished |
| misbehavior resolved by action of student | misbehavior resolved by punishment |
| explanation and discussion of standards | action and few words; no discussion |
| focus on student's role and responsibility in behavioral situation and effects of behavior on self and others | focus on overt misbehavior and violation of external standards |
| emphasis on developing cognitive controls over behavior | emphasis on concrete situation at hand |
| focus on student resolving the misbehavior | focus on role of adult providing punishment |
| no punishment when student takes the initiative to correct the behavior | correction of behavior not emphasized, punishment is |
| enhances identification and modeling | distances learner from socializing agent |

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR CMQ SCORES BY PROFESSION

| | Experienced Classroom Teachers N = 158 | | Teacher Education Majors N = 155 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard deviation | Mean | Standard deviation | F ratio | Significance of difference |
| Classroom Management Questionnaire | 27.50 | 4.44 | 27.15 | 4.26 | .53 | < .48 |
| Aggressive Subscale | 9.07 | 1.66 | 8.67 | 1.76 | 4.23 | < .04 |
| Dependent Subscale | 8.01 | 2.36 | 8.28 | 1.98 | 1.26 | < .26 |
| Academic Subscale | 10.42 | 1.63 | 10.18 | 1.61 | 1.76 | < .19 |
| Male Subscale | 13.54 | 2.54 | 13.12 | 2.45 | 2.22 | < .14 |
| Female Subscale | 13.97 | 2.39 | 14.03 | 2.38 | .05 | < .82 |

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR CMQ SCORES BY GENDER
FOR EXPERIENCED CLASSROOM TEACHERS

| | Male N = 30 | | Female N = 128 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard deviation | Mean | Standard deviation | F ratio | Significance of difference |
| Classroom Management Questionnaire | 26.20 | 4.37 | 27.82 | 4.44 | 3.26 | < .07 |
| Aggressive Subscale | 8.70 | 1.39 | 9.16 | 1.72 | 1.83 | < .17 |
| Dependent Subscale | 7.37 | 2.11 | 8.17 | 2.40 | 2.85 | < .09 |
| Academic Subscale | 10.13 | 1.98 | 10.48 | 1.55 | 1.12 | NS |
| Male Subscale | 12.40 | 2.36 | 13.82 | 2.52 | 7.90 | < .006 |
| Female Subscale | 13.80 | 2.54 | 14.02 | 2.37 | .20 | NS |

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR CMQ SCORES BY GENDER
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION MAJORS

| | Male N = 50 | | Female N = 105 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard deviation | Mean | Standard deviation | F ratio | Significance of difference |
| Classroom Management Questionnaire | 25.14 | 3.59 | 28.06 | 4.24 | 17.63 | < .001 |
| Aggressive Subscale | 7.76 | 1.61 | 9.09 | 1.66 | 22.03 | < .001 |
| Dependent Subscale | 7.52 | 1.62 | 8.64 | 2.05 | 11.47 | < .001 |
| Academic Subscale | 9.78 | 1.64 | 10.35 | 1.56 | 4.39 | < .04 |
| Male Subscale | 11.74 | 2.35 | 13.76 | 2.22 | 27.00 | < .001 |
| Female Subscale | 13.36 | 1.99 | 14.32 | 2.49 | 5.74 | < .02 |

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR PERSONALITY MEASURES
BY PROFESSION

| | Experienced Classroom Teachers | | | Teacher Education Majors | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard deviation | N | Mean | Standard deviation | N | *F* ratio | Significance of difference |
| Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale | 8.40 | 3.52 | 30 | 9.66 | 3.24 | 50 | 2.66 | < .10 |
| Rokeach Dogmatism Scale | 11.69 | 5.19 | 36 | 15.55 | 5.99 | 38 | 8.72 | < .005 |
| Machiavellianism V Scale | 96.24 | 6.71 | 25 | 95.91 | 8.16 | 34 | .03 | < .85 |
| Spielberger State Anxiety Scale | 35.00 | 7.38 | 9 | 37.40 | 7.18 | 25 | .73 | < .41 |
| Spielberger Trait Anxiety Scale | 32.11 | 5.21 | 9 | 37.39 | 8.46 | 23 | 3.02 | < .09 |

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR PERSONALITY MEASURES BY GENDER FOR EXPERIENCED CLASSROOM TEACHERS

| | Male | | | Female | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard deviation | N | Mean | Standard deviation | N | F ratio | Significance of difference |
| Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale | 8.50 | 1.73 | 4 | 8.38 | 3.74 | 26 | .00 | NS |
| Rokeach Dogmatism Scale | 15.00 | 4.24 | 2 | 11.82 | 4.97 | 33 | .78 | NS |
| Machiavellianism V Scale | 96.00 | 2.00 | 3 | 96.27 | 7.15 | 22 | .00 | NS |
| Spielberger State Anxiety Scale | ----- | ---- | | 35.00 | 7.89 | 8 | --- | -- |
| Spielberger Trait Anxiety Scale | ----- | ---- | | 32.50 | 5.42 | 8 | --- | -- |

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR PERSONALITY MEASURES BY GENDER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION MAJORS

| | Male | | | Female | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Standard deviation | N | Mean | Standard deviation | N | F ratio | Significance of difference |
| Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale | 10.76 | 2.80 | 17 | 9.44 | 3.62 | 39 | 1.81 | < .18 |
| Rokeach Dogmatism Scale | 17.50 | 6.45 | 10 | 15.15 | 5.79 | 33 | 1.20 | < .28 |
| Machiavellianism V Scale | 97.64 | 8.42 | 11 | 95.66 | 7.76 | 32 | .51 | < .49 |
| Spielberger State Anxiety Scale | 36.78 | 5.78 | 9 | 38.64 | 10.13 | 25 | .27 | < .62 |
| Spielberger Trait Anxiety Scale | 34.75 | 5.60 | 8 | 39.33 | 9.81 | 24 | 1.55 | < .22 |

TABLE 8

CORRELATION OF TOTAL CMQ SCORE WITH SELECTED PERSONALITY MEASURES

| | Experienced Teachers | | | Teacher Education Majors | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Correlation | Significance | N | Correlation | Significance | N |
| Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale | -0.106 | .58 | 30 | -0.247 | .08 | 50 |
| Rokeach Dogmatism Scale | -0.089 | .61 | 36 | -0.446 | .005 | 38 |
| Machiavellianism V Scale | -0.091 | .67 | 25 | -0.176 | .32 | 34 |
| Spielberger State Anxiety Scale | 0.135 | .73 | 9 | 0.149 | .49 | 24 |
| Spielberger Trait Anxiety Scale | 0.001 | NS | 9 | 0.252 | .26 | 22 |